



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/679,039

10/03/2003

Lev Salnikov

1661

7590  
Donald W. Meeker  
Patent Agent  
924 East Ocean Front #E  
Newport Beach, CA 92661

05/17/2007

EXAMINER

FUBARA, BLESSING M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1618

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/17/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/679,039

Applicant(s)

SALNIKOV, LEV

Examiner

Blessing M. Fubara

Art Unit

1618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-8 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Examiner acknowledges receipt of response to the election/restriction requirement and remarks filed 2/15/07.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-4 in the reply filed on 2/15/07 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Claims 1-4 are examined. Claims 5-8 are withdrawn from consideration.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for polydextrose as the polyion and ntros-metyl-urea as a chemotherapeutic agent, does not reasonably provide enablement for all polyion polymers and to all the wide variety of chemotherapeutic drugs. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. This is scope of enablement.

Art Unit: 1618

Enablement is considered in view of the Wands factors (MPEP 2164.01(a)). The court in Wands states: "Enablement is not precluded by the necessity for some experimentation such as routine screening. However, experimentation needed to practice the invention must not be undue experimentation. The key word is 'undue,' not 'experimentation.'" (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). Clearly, enablement of a claimed invention cannot be predicated on the basis of quantity of experimentation required to make or use the invention. "Whether undue experimentation is needed is not a single, simple factual determination, but rather is a conclusion reached by weighing many factual considerations." (*Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1404). The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required include: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount or direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims. While all of these factors are considered, a sufficient number of the factors are discussed below for a *prima facie* case.

A) The nature of the invention: Claim 1 is drawn to a composition comprising polyion, chemotherapeutic drug and glucose solution.

B) The state of the prior art: The art recognizes a variety of chemotherapeutic agents. For example Wang and Li (The University of Texas System Board of Regents), adriamycin, 5-fluorouracil (5-FU), etoposide (VP-16), camptothecin, actinomycin-D, mitomycin C, cisplatin and hydrogen peroxide are identified as chemotherapeutic agents (column 55, lines 57-61). Also, Pevarello et al. (US 6,114,365) identifies taxane, taxane derivatives, CPT-11, camptothecin derivatives, anthracycline glycosides, e.g., doxorubicin or epirubicin, etoposide, navelbine,

Art Unit: 1618

vinblastine, carboplatin, cisplatin and as chemotherapeutic agents (column 17, lines 39-45).

While all the above are known in the art, the claims are directed to one compound, nitros-metyl-urea without any mention of other chemotherapeutic agents in the specification. Prior art search for the term “nitros-metyl-urea” or nitrous-methyl-urea” or nitrous-metyl-urea yields applicant’s current work. Furthermore, polydextrose is the only polyion that the application mentions.

C) The amount of direction or guidance present -The specification only provides one polymer that is a polyion that is polydextrose and nitros-metyl-urea as the one chemotherapeutic drug.

D) The breadth of the claims: The claims are drawn compositions.

E) The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan for the reasons stated above.

F) The relative skill of those skilled in the art. Based on the unpredictable nature of the invention, one skilled in the art would not have envisioned practicing the invention without the exercise of undue experimentation and burden.

In consideration of each of factors above, it is apparent that there is undue experimentation because of variability in prediction of outcome that is not addressed by the present application disclosure, examples, teaching and guidance presented. Absent factual data to the contrary, the amount and level of experimentation needed is undue and the resultant outcome not predictable.

It is noted that the specification must teach those of skill in the art how to make and how to use the invention as broadly claimed. In re Goodman, 29 USPQ2d at 2013 (Fed. Cir. 1994), citing In re Vaeck, 20 USPQ2d at 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Art Unit: 1618

The courts have stated that reasonable correlation must exist between scope of exclusive right to patent application and scope of enablement set forth in patent application. 27 USPQ2d 1662 *Ex parte Maizel*.

Scope of Enablement is considered in view of the Wands factors (MPEP 2164.01 (a)). In view of the quantity of experimentation necessary to determine the parameters listed above, the lack of direction or guidance provided by the specification, the absence of working examples for the demonstration or correlation to the claimed invention, it would require undue experimentation to practice the invention.

4. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. This is enablement.

While the claims are directed to composition, the preamble of the claim states the intended use of the composition as being selective for cancer cell chemotherapy. The support for a composition for treating any kind of cancer is lacking.

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation have been summarized in Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986) and reiterated by the Court of Appeals in In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 at 1404 (CAFC 1988). The factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required include: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount or direction presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

Art Unit: 1618

The Board also stated that although the level of skill in molecular biology is high, the results of experiments in genetic engineering are unpredictable. While all of these factors are considered, a sufficient number of the factors are discussed below for a *prima facie* case.

Nature of the invention state of the prior art, relative skill of those in the art and the predictability of the art.

The nature of the invention is a composition wherein the composition comprises is for cancer, the broad term encompassing a wide variety of cancers. However, claim 1 recites "cancer" representing different types of cancers that have not been proven by the application to the claimed composition. The nature of the invention is very broad, and the relative skill of those in the art is generally that of a Ph.D. or M.D. with expertise in the field of cancers having specific etiology and specific characteristic. One specific composition, such as the one claimed, cannot be effective for all the wide variety of cancers.

It is clear that the art to which the present invention relates is highly unpredictable and unreliable with respect to conclusions drawn from laboratory data extrapolated to clinical efficacy.

The breadth of the claims

The claims are very broad and inclusive of a wide representation of cancers.

The amount of direction or guidance provided and the presence or absence of working examples

There are no working examples to any specific cancer-type and the claimed composition. There is no one general mechanism of action for the treatment of cancers.

The quantity of experimentation necessary

Art Unit: 1618

Presently, guidance is lacking in the specification as to which cancers are considered/contemplated. There is really no one composition that can be said to be effective for all cancers. The specification does not provide structural and biochemical basis for the claimed composition for cancer cell selective chemotherapy having a priori expectations of success for using the claimed composition. Since each prospective embodiment, as well as future embodiments as the art progresses, would have to be empirically tested, undue experimentation would be required to practice the invention as it is claimed in its current scope. The specification provides inadequate guidance to do otherwise.

In consideration of each of factors above, it is apparent that there is undue experimentation because of variability in prediction of outcome that is not addressed by the present application disclosure, examples, teaching and guidance presented. Absent factual data to the contrary, the amount and level of experimentation needed is undue and the resultant outcome not predictable.

It is noted that the specification must teach those of skill in the art how to make and how to use the invention as broadly claimed. In re Goodman, 29 USPQ2d at 2013 (Fed. Cir. 1994), citing In re Vaeck, 20 USPQ2d at 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The courts have stated that reasonable correlation must exist between scope of exclusive right to patent application and scope of enablement set forth in patent application. 27 USPQ2d 1662 *Ex parte Maizel*.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –



Art Unit: 1618

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakurada et al. (US 6,190,680).

Sakurada is contemplated for aqueous compositions for delivery of chemotherapeutic agents in the presence of polyhydric alcohols (abstract). One of the polymers is polydextrose (column 3, line 33), which meets the requirement for polyion polymer. Glucose, sucrose and lactose (column 4, lines 47-49) are some of the polyhydric alcohols named. Since the composition is an aqueous composition, it flows that the glucose is in solution meeting the requirement of claim 1. Examples of drugs in the composition are mitomycin, adriamycin, vinblastine sulfate, which meet the limitation of chemotherapeutic agent of claim 1. Claims 2 and 3 recite the properties/characteristic/intended use of the composition so that the claims are met.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Blessing M. Fubara whose telephone number is (571) 272-0594. The examiner can normally be reached on 7 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. (Monday to Thursday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Hartley can be reached on (571) 272-0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1618

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Blessing Fubara  
Patent Examiner  
Tech. Center 1600

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Blessing Fubara", is written over the printed name.